

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request consideration of the subject application as amended herein. This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed May 24, 2005. Claims 1-20, 34-40, 42-53 and 55-61 stand rejected. Claims 21-33, 41 and 54 are objected to. In this Amendment, Claim 1 has been amended. No new matter has been added.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 5, 12-18, 26-28, 34-40, 42, 45-47, 49-52, 55 and 61 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ugawa (U.S. Patent No. 5,836,819). The Examiner also rejected claims 3, 4 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ugawa (U.S. Patent No. 5,836,819), in view of Pierce et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,139,013). The Examiner rejected claims 6-8, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ugawa (U.S. Patent No. 5,836,819), in view of Sines et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,203,009 B1). The Examiner rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ugawa (U.S. Patent No. 5,836,819), in view of Sines et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,203,009 B1), as applied to claim 6-8 above, in further view of Lynch et al (GB 2,243,236). The Examiner rejected claims 19 and 53 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ugawa (U.S. Patent No. 5,836,819) in view of Peters (U.S. Patent No. 4,508,343). The Examiner rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ugawa (U.S. Patent No. 5,836,819) in view of Peters (U.S. Patent No. 4,508,343), as applied to claim 19 above, in further view of Tastad (U.S. Patent No. 5,194,094). The

Examiner rejected claims 43 and 44 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ugawa (U.S. Patent No. 5,836,819) in view of Eriko et al (JP 09-103,541). The Examiner rejected claims 56 and 57 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ugawa (U.S. Patent No. 5,836,819) in view of Adams (U.S. Patent No. 5,882,261). The Examiner rejected claim 58 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ugawa (U.S. Patent No. 5,836,819) in view of Adams (U.S. Patent No. 5,882,261), as applied to claim 56 above, in further view of Bennett (U.S. Patent No. 5,085,436). The Examiner rejected claims 59 and 60 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ugawa (U.S. Patent No. 5,836,819) in view of Adams (U.S. Patent No. 5,882,261), as applied to claim 56 above, in further view of Heinen et al (DE 3638100 A).

Claim 1 has been amended to add the limitation:

at least one of the game outcomes being the award of a feature outcome, the feature outcome being the awarding of either a feature event or feature game or the awarding of a jackpot prize, the feature outcome being awarded when the reel game outcome and the pin and ball game outcome, when combined, together define a winning combination.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as amended, is in condition for allowance.

Ugawa is directed to a game system having a pocket (pachinko) game and a reel game together in a single display. In Ugawa, the game system first determines whether a winning combination for the pocket game has been achieved (S61, S63 in Ugawa), and, subsequently, determines whether a winning combination for the reel game has been achieved (S56, S57, S60, S65 in Ugawa).

The winning combinations are then added together to determine the total winning outcome (credits awarded) for each game (S66, S67, S68, S70B in Ugawa).

In contrast, in the presently claimed invention, a winning combination is not determined until after play of both the pocket game and reel game have completed. A winning combination is therefore not achieved on one game or the other. Instead, a determination as to whether a winning combination has or has not been achieved only when the result of one game is incorporated into the result of the other game. This is not taught or suggested by Ugawa.

By waiting to determine whether a winning combination has occurred until after the results of both games have been determined, several outcomes, such as a feature event, a feature game or a jackpot prize may be awarded. For example, extra balls, free games, additional games (such as, for example, a chocolate wheel) or win multipliers may be awarded depending on particular events that occur during the play of each of the games. Also, a special feature can be awarded when particular events are triggered during the games. For example, if each of the pins in a row are hit, a first feature prize may be awarded, while a second feature prize may be awarded if all of the balls hit a particular pin, and a third feature prize may be awarded if a particular combination of reels is achieved.

By waiting to determine whether a winning combination has occurred until after the results of both games have been determined, the feature outcomes can also change on a game by game basis. For example, in a first game, a free game is awarded if each of the pins in a row are hit, while in the second game, the score for the reel game is multiplied by a number if each of the pins in a row are hit. It is

also possible that even though “winning events” have occurred (e.g., a combination of identical symbols in the reel game or balls falling into a pocket in the pocket game), the combination of the reel game and pocket game results result in a determination that no prize is awarded.

These outcomes, which are only determined after the results of both games have been combined, add interest to the game, which keeps players amused and more willing to continue playing the game.

Accordingly, Ugawa does not teach or suggest:

at least one of the game outcomes being the award of a feature outcome, the feature outcome being the awarding of either a feature event or feature game or the awarding of a jackpot prize, the feature outcome being awarded when the reel game outcome and the pin and ball game outcome, when combined, together define a winning combination.

This feature is also missing from each of the other references cited by the Examiner.

Thus, claim 1 and its corresponding dependent claims 2-61 are patentable over Ugawa.

Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call Stephen M. De Klerk at (408) 720-8300.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 02-2666. Any necessary extension of time for response not already requested is Nicholas Luke Bennett, et al. Application No.: 09/902,901

Examiner: Jason M. Skaarup
Art Unit: 3714

hereby requested. Please charge any corresponding fee to Deposit Account No.
02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP



Stephen M. De Klerk
Reg. No. 46,503

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300